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# Voters

## 1AR Theory

### 1ar – no stance on RVI

Vote on fairness, Judges must vote for the better debater – they can’t if rounds are skewed. Vote on education-it’s why schools fund debate and provides portable skills for the real world.

Drop the debater to: A. Set a positive norm, B. Deter future abuse, C. Rectify time lost running theory

Competing interps since 1. Reasonability causes a race to the bottom, but competing interps maximizes fairness and education. 2. Reasonability collapses to competing interps-you use an offense-defense paradigm to determine reasonability which cedes the authority of competing interps.

### 1AR—2NR RVIs Bad

All neg warrants for RVIs must be in the 1NC. They violate if they read a 2NR RVI. Prefer: A. Clash-initiating the RVI earlier ensures a more nuanced debate about the benefits of giving it to you. Starting it in the 2NR means we get no clash and we might set bad norms for the round and make the wrong theory decision. B. stratskew-the 2AR is too short to cover a neg RVI dump and win substance so you make it impossible to form a coherent strategy.

## 1NC

### Theory

D. Voters

Vote on fairness, Judges must vote for the better debater – they can’t if rounds are skewed. Vote on education-it’s why schools fund debate and it provides portable skills for the real world.

Drop the debater to: A. Set a positive norm, B. Deter future abuse, C. Rectify time lost running theory

Competing interps since 1. Reasonability causes a race to the bottom, 2. Reasonability collapses to competing interps-you use an offense-defense paradigm to determine reasonability.

No RVIs. 1. Illogical. Just since you are fair doesn’t mean you should win, otherwise both debaters would win fair rounds automatically, which would be irresolvable, and resolvability comes first since every debate needs a winner. 2. Chilling effect. Either I read theory and you beat me with your 4 minute prep out or I don’t read theory and abusive practices prevail-both kill fairness. 3. Topical clash. RVIs kill substantive debate. Once theory is initiated we can never go back to substance, since it’s unnecessary so nobody will engage in the topic. 4. Norm setting. I can’t concede that the counter-interp is better even if I come to that realization in the middle of the round, so the RVI forces debaters to argue for bad debate practices, which is inimical to the most fair and educational interps in the long run.

### T

D. Voters. 1. Vote on fairness, debate’s a competitive activity with wins and losses-if the round is skewed towards once debater you can longer test debate skill. 2. Education is a voter since it’s the end goal of debate and provides portable skills-also why schools fund debate in the first place. 3. Jurisdiction is a voter since if the aff isn’t topical it’s out of your jurisdiction to vote on; the ballot implies you vote for the better aff and resolution clarifies what that means – so default neg since I’m the only one with an advocacy. This also implies you evaluate T before theory 1) jurisdiction constrains other standards, 2) my abuse is responsive.

Drop the debater on T: 1. Drop the arg is severance – you’ll read new args in the 1A or piece together parts of case-skews my strat since I don’t know what you’ll argue for. 2. Drop the arg discourages the neg from reading T; it moots all of the NC – incentivizes you to go for blatantly non T affs so none of my offense is relevant 3. I had to spend time reading T and you’re at an advantage since there’s a limited number of words in the res. 4. Deterrence – writing a new AC takes a while so dropping you is key.

Competing interps : 1. Reasonability causes a race to the bottom. 2. It’s arbitrary. 3. Collapses to competing interps – you use an offense-defense paradigm to determine it 3. Topicality’s a binary so reasonability’s illogical

No RVIs. 1. Illogical. Just since you’re fair doesn’t mean you win. If that were true, both debaters would win rounds without theory, which would be irresolvable; resolvability comes first since every debate needs a winner. 2. Chilling effect. Either I read theory and you beat me with your 4 minute prep out or I don’t read theory and abusive practices prevail-both kill fairness. 3. Topical clash. RVIs kill substantive debate. Once theory is initiated we can never go back to substance, since it’s unnecessary so nobody will engage in the topic. 4. Norm setting. I can’t concede the counter-interp is better; RVI forces debaters to argue for bad debate practices.

## Education ≠ A Voter

Theory’s only a voter for fairness. Education doesn’t matter:

1. Jurisdiction – It’s outside the role of your ballot. Your job as a judge is to vote for the better debater -- i.e. the one that wins argument son the flow, not to promote some out of round benefit: this obligation o/w on strength of link a) it’s written on the ballot making it most resolvable, b) can’t be a debate judge without judging debaters; if your best shot’s on substance then you must vote there; jurisdiction o/w everything 1) it’s the only link between good and ought which determines how judges vote – any refutation that says judges have other obligations cedes obligations come first so I outweigh on strength of link, 2) it’s a filter for other voters.
2. Not in your jurisdiction to vote since it’s irresolveable – they don’t define education and it can mean lots of things

Mac Dictionary defines education

[1] the process of receiving or giving systematic instruction, especially at a school or university: a new system of public education.

• the theory and practice of [2] teaching: colleges of education.

• [3] a body of knowledge acquired while being educated: his education is encyclopedic and eclectic.

• [4] information about or training in a particular field or subject: health education.

2 [5](an education) an enlightening experience: a day with those kids was an education in patience and forbearance.

Resolvability matters since it constrains your ability to vote for the better debater; it also means voting on theory’s not educational since irresolvable arguments mean we can’t engage and realize flaws in ideas; also means they can’t leverage their education arguments since you can’t weigh an argument that means nothing

1. No link to voter – these are reasons education are good but don’t prescribe obligation; cupcakes are good too but that’s not a reason the judge should buy me one; also means reasons that education are good are reasons debaters should try to be educational but not reasons the judge must enforce education; their education warrants just beg the question
2. Non unique— a) we’ve done all of our research before we enter the round. No reason why saying arguments out loud increases education, b) people will get what they want out of the activity, which also means 1) t – even if education’s good enforcing it’s bad since it creates a universal rule for a subjective concept so people can’t focus on their interests in round and will quit, 2) t – education’s irresolveable since it means different things to everyone c) Anything that happens in-round will constitute some sort of education. Debaters will still garner the benefits of learning to run their positions under different conditions and making strategic decisions under pressure.
3. Not voting on theory’s best for education: a) theory can’t make rounds educational – we can’t undo the initial problem – judges only have power in this round since otherwise they’d be responsible for an infinite number of consequences and probably should be in another country doing educational charity work instead of judging, b) education is usually a voter so it’s interesting and educational to think about the world without it
4. Adherence to education is infinitely regressive. Debate could be much more educational if we abandoned constraints like speech times and refutation, but this would destroy necessary conditions for debate.

### A2 – Why Schools Fund Debate

1. Schools won’t suddenly stop supporting debate because of an uneducational practice. A) This hasn't happened yet, B) lots of teachers at don’t even know you debate both sides, 2) they can’t understand spreading so won’t know if it’s educational, C) schools want debate teams so they have a good rep. Default me – burden of proof’s on them since it’s an empirical claim w/out an empirical warrant
2. No impact – schools don’t need funding, debaters do
3. N/u – Hunter gets no funding anyway
4. No reason this is our responsibility

### A2 “Why People Debate”

1. Empirical claim w/out an empirical warrant – people do it for lots of reasons including – a) to get into college, b) since they like mind games, c) since research is interesting, d) since competition’s fun, e) to have some educational round at some point; that probably happened so it doesn’t have to be this round

## Fairness ≠ A Voter

1. Dictionary.com defines debate: **a formal contest in which the affirmative and negative sides of a proposition are advocated by opposing speakers.[[1]](#footnote-1)** The res is all you’re given pre round so it’s the proposition we’re debating; means the better debate is the one who argues for or against the res– o/w probability – 1) words are determined based on dictionaries so you need one to explain what it means to be a better debater; dictionaries demonstrate consensus, 2) contextualization – my definition’s best since debate’s a contest and we have aff and neg, 3) generally what people consider debate to mean – e.g. parents are confused as to why theory exists, 4) logical consistency – they wouldn’t give us a res if we weren’t expected to debate it. AND – jurisdiction comes first 1) it’s the only link between good and ought which determines how judges vote – any refutation that says judges have other obligations cedes obligations come first so I outweigh on strength of link, 2) it’s a filter for other voters. Fairness isn’t in your jurisdiction 1) better debaters do better research on the res so theory introduces a layer that better debaters don’t necessarily win, 2) theory means you don’t evaluate the person who’s said the res is true or false, 3) fairness isn’t quantifiable since some things are harder for some debaters so it’s irresolveable which can’t be in your jurisdiction since you’ll vote randomly, 4) Any good argument makes it harder to debate, since people can say winning makes them lose so it’s not fair; to make debate fully equal we would have to not debate about topics, 5) there’s no rule book with rules intrinsic to the activity, AND reasons fairness are good aren’t reasons judges must promote it so your offense doesn’t link; non-unique – you should make petitions and get your interp made an official debate rule, solves all your offense
2. Theory is more unfair – a) to debate theory you have to pay thousands of dollars to go to camp which makes debate exclusionary since it builds structural disadvantage into the activity; this outweigh the specific abuse stories on scope since it applies to theory as a whole; also means your shell’s non-unqiue b) better theory debaters win theory, not people with greater abuse stories, c) topical debate’s most fair – 1) predictability – we get the topic ahead of time – lets us both make highest quality arguments on issues 2) time skew –one debater gets a restart and has a time advantage when it’s introduced; topic gives us both 13 minutes; matters since all arguments can be traded linearly for time, 3) ex-post facto imposition of rules is bad 1) they can’t be constitutive of the activity if they’re always changing, 2) kill predictability

### A2 “jurisdiction is better debater, not the better cheater”

1. These are just words; they didn’t show a distinction – this is like saying; I asked for food not frozen yogurt!
2. Round’s not skewed – be just as unfair as you think I was right back at me
3. The better debater’s the better winner; pr

## Drop the Debater

### Extensions & Weighing

Extend the a and b point-dropping the debater discourages them from engaging in future unfair practices and sets a positive norm. This outweighs your warrants: A. scope-your world entails repeated violations of my interp which causes tons of abuse in future rounds. B. probability-empirically confirmed, norms like disclosure theory, NIBs bad have been set on the activity out of fear of violation. C. magnitude – this round’s already skewed but future rounds will be 100% fair from the getgo. D. Longevity – impacts all future rounds; not just this one.

Extend the c point –substance is permanently skewed since I’ve had to invest time into the shell so going back to substance means you might be voting for the wrong debater. This outweighs: A. most specific to your role as a judge-you must determine the better debater which is no longer possible on substance. B. all your warrants presuppose an ability to engage substantively-I’ve proven that I couldn’t do that which means there is no possible benefit to rejecting the argument. Also, a tiny 1%1 risk of it effecting your substance decision warrants drop the debater since it will always be more objective to resolve the round on this layer as opposed to the skewed one. C. Jurisdiction – judge has to vote for the better debater not the better cheater

Next

1. strat skew; changing the function of arguments mid round is unfair since I can’t form a coherent strategy – key since otherwise I can’t form a path to the ballot
2. Never solves the original abuse – the arguments on the aff that are abusive are sufficient for you and necessary for me, otherwise you significantly impede my chance of winning and becoming educated in the round, dropping the debater is necessary to ensure arguments are recipricol, k2 fairness since we need equal capacity to generate offense in order to have equal pathways to the ballot
3. Incentivizes debates to spew abusive arguments to bait me into reading theory, kills a) stable advocacy since what you defend changes through round, key to education since it lets us have substantive position comparison and learn about benefits and flaws of our own ideas, also holds us to a higher standard since we have to defend positions for the whole round, also kills fairness since I can’t form a coherent path to the ballot if I don’t know what you’ll defend for the round so I can’t figure out how to disprove you

### A2 Substantive Education

1. Cross apply the #1 warrant for drop the debater-substantive debate was impossible since you have skewed the evaluation of substance and I wasn’t able to engage in the first place.

2. T-if theory is drop the argument, people will read even more theory since they won’t be afraid of dealing with the RVI debate.

3. T-dropping the arg means people will have to read more theory in order to gain a strategic advantage from it so there will be more frivolous shells everywhere.

4. T-people will be really abusive since theory’s no risk so substantive debate will suck

### A2 Intervention

1. T-theory is easier to resolve than substance since there are a set of common arguments that are always made and we know how most paradigmatic debates resolve themselves since they’ve happened so many times.

2. T-dropping the argument means we have determine which arguments to drop-which can cause intervention when it’s unclear what the conjunctive clauses of the interpretation mean.

3. Non unique-a large level of judge intervention will always exist by virtue of judges having different beliefs that can subconsciously influence their decisions,especially since topics are controversial

4.T – if you can’t overcome judge bias then you’re the worse debater so the judge is obligated to vote for me

### A2 More Realistic

1. Contextually, in the debate sense, you have committed the equivalent of murder since I’ve won a large abuse story on my initial shell.

2. No reason why having theory norms that are realistic to the criminal justice system is good-they are fundamentally different since debate is just a game.

### A2 Wasn’t Told Rule b4 Round

1. The theory debate is about establishing in round norms so out of round impacts are irrelevant.

2. This is non-verifiable-you don’t know that I didn’t tell them the rule before the round. They don’t have proof of this.

3. T-voting on theory means more people will know about the norm since they’ll hear about how the round went which causes more people to know rules.

4. Fairness/education matter so if I win the theory debate it’s objectively true your practice is bad

### A2 I invested time reading drop the argument

1. Still unreciprocal-warranting drop the argument shouldn’t take more than forty-five seconds whereas the shell took up minutes of my strategy.

2. You had the option to read drop the argument whereas I had to read theory since you were abusive. You could have also read reasonability, a counter interp, etc. which means you still get to choose the optimal strategy whereas I was forced to skew my substance strategy.

3. Strat skew claim takes this out – outweighs since this was a bad strategic choice you made so abuse is self-imposed, whereas you impose abuse when you change the function of my shell

## Drop the Argument

### Reject the Arg Dump

1. Drop the arg is much more realistic-we don’t give the death penalty for minor offenses. I might have been slightly abusive but that doesn’t justify a total loss. That’s key to real world education since it models the judicial process. Also key to proportional punishment which is key to evaluating how much I should be punished.

2. Drop the debater harms substantive education: A. it creates an incentive to read more theory since it gives debaters an easy win. B. dropping the argument lets us go back to substance and get topical clash there-we can still discuss the res. This outweighs: substantive education is the only portable benefit from debate.

3. Drop the debater increases judge intervention. Theory debates are generally blippy and hard to flow so resolving the debate there increases the chance that the round is adjudicated incorrectly. Intervention is the strongest link to fairness since the round isn’t decided on who did the better debating.

4. Dropping the debater encourages people to go prep out your shell, continue the abusive practice, bait theory, and then always win the counter interp which proliferates abuse. This also turns your deterrence warrants and outweighs on probability—no one ever actual stops abusive practices from theory shells like yours.

### A2 Deterrence

1. Dropping the arg solves-if debaters keep losing something they’ll stop reading it since it’s unstrategic.

2.. You might win the theory debate since you’re a better theory debater than me, not since your norm is better, which would mean you’re enforcing a bad norm of the activity

3. Potential deterrence doesn’t justify a voter, a) jurisdiction means you can only evaluate in round impacts. B) Trust me, I won’t be deterred., c) empirically denied – adolescents don’t learn from mistakes

**Bishop 2k**[[2]](#footnote-2)

A fundamental tenet is that **adolescents are immature** (Bernard 1992; Scott and Grisso 1997; Feld 1999). Their **lesser capacities for reasoning** and moral judgment **diminish** their **culpability** and render them undeserving of the full burden of retributive punishments (Zimring 1981, 1991, 1998; Forst and Blomquist 1991; Scott and Grisso 1997). Moreover, from a purely utilitarian perspective, their **limited ability to anticipate and weigh long-term consequences makes it unlikely that** threats of criminal **sanctions will deter them** (Teitelbaum 1991). Finally, cultural conceptions of children and adolescents have traditionally emphasized youths' dependency and vulnerability, characteristics that tend to evoke compassionate responses rather than punitive ones.

4. Empirically denied in this context. Even if I had not engaged in the abusive practice, they would have just found another shell to read against me since they love reading theory.

### A2 Timeskew/Substance Skewed

1. Either this argument isn’t important and me losing it does nothing, or dropping it is a big deal and rectifies time lost
2. Timeskews aren’t important: A. we both get 13 minutes to speak so there’s no net advantage one side has, B. you can get faster or more efficient to deal with the timeskew theory may create
3. Doesn’t justify a loss. Reading a link turn to a K skews your time since you have to answer it but that doesn’t mean you should win for answering it.
4. Self inflicted injury-you’ve spent so much time justifying this shell yourself-that shouldn’t be on me. You could have just answered my arguments or made the shell a lot shorter.; improved strat and efficiency solve
5. I have to justify drop the argument; solves 100%.
6. Some timeskew is good for education- forces you to make more strategic decisions about what to go for.
7. *Stop complaining-you’re the neg and you get a 6 minute 2NR to go for anything so you’ll always have other outs and layers.*

## Competing Interps

1. Reasonability is arbitrary. A. I avoid an illogical cutoff point for reasonability since your bright-line is random and impossible determine who meets it. I don’t know the judge’s meter for […] is. B. no warrant why the bright-line you posit’s key – double bind, either 1) it’s self-referential so begs the question, or 2) is determined based on offense-defense which cedes competing interps is true; also means WCS we should do my interp and then use reasonability for the rest of interps since we get benefits of both and have most fair and educational rounds: Outweighs on strength of link to fairness -- no debate can be decided on merit and we can’t engage if args can’t be compared.
2. Norms creation – A. Unclear norms and paradigms prevent norms creation, B. We compare offense back to independent interps to find the best one, C. clash – we focus argument comparison in one part of the flow – key since questioning lets us realize flaws with ideas and best arguments are found through comparison o/w your education offense on 1) longevity since people follow rules in the future not just in this specific round, 2) scope since it impacts the whole community, not just us
3. If unfair practices are bad, they should be minimized since we should have less bad things. This outweighs: A. Infinite abuse-under reasonability there’s no structural check on this-people will always get away with playing defense. B. fairer norms set by competing interps allow for more clash and engagement in substantive debates – means the loss of substance under CI is self-correcting. C. Competing interps is the only way debaters are encouraged justify their practices beforehand. It’s better if we have to ensure we are proactively fair in advance to DECREASE theory in rounds.
4. Jurisdiction – if substance is skewed you can’t vote for the better debater, even a marginal skew inhibits ability to arbitrate
5. Indicts of CI are potential abuse claims – if I win impacts to my theory argument, then it wasn’t frivolous anymore and we don’t need to adopt a bright-line since none of your arguments link.
6. *Reasonability collapses to CI: A. You have to give offensive reasons to prefer reasonability to competing interps to win that debate, which means the logic of your paradigm justification concedes the offense-defense model for evaluating theory debates – if not it’s still illogical since reasons why reasonability is itself reasonable are circular and infinitely regressive. B. Indicts of CI are potential abuse claims – if I win impacts to my theory argument, then it wasn’t frivolous anymore and we don’t need to adopt a bright-line since none of your arguments link.*

## Reasonability

### Impartial Adjudication

Fairness should not be about making sure debaters have an equal chance of winning. Instead, it should be about the judge impartially deciding who the better debater is. To clarify, the judge should only vote on fairness claims that impact back to impartial adjudication, not preserving equal outcomes. Prefer: A. Resolvability – 1) fairness and education claims can’t be weighed against structural skews in the activity – e.g. time skew, 2) different debaters skills make different strats abusive or non-abusive; numerical abuse is quantifiable 3) impossible to distinguish between being substantively abusive and being better; e.g. reading an aff that is true means you’re a better researcher – competing interps leads to a race to the bottom where you can’t vote for better debaters which is bad for a) jurisdiction – matters since that’s how we derive obligations, b) education – best ideas are excluded; resolvability’s an independent voter since we can only debate if our arguments can be compared, and judges can’t vote for better debaters if they can’t arbitrate between arguments made. B. Substantive engagement – better debaters can overcome strategies that make it harder by improved research skills so it incentivizes engaging difficult positions, different number of burdens means that one debater has to be [ ] times as good so it requires uplayering.

Reasonability’s better than competing interps:

1. Competing interpretations means a 1% link to unfairness is enough to drop me, kills education since discussing potential round improvements mean they never happen since we debate rules for substance without applying them
2. Competing interps kills accessibility since standards of answering abuse claims requires knowledge external to things that are intuitively true – the instinct is to claim that there’s no implication to a strategy instead of explaining why a) an individual is the most educational, or b) structuring a counterinterpretation to the initial story, o/w on a) scope since it impacts a large number of debaters who want to join the activity, b)
3. Incentivizes debaters to craft absurd abuse scenarios that lead to a marginal harm but don’t inhibit judge ability to arbitrate

### Quantifiable Abuse

Theory’s an issue of reasonability with a brightline of quantifiable abuse – to clarify the only legitimate abuse claims are ones that link back to a numerical shift in burden structures; e.g. 2-1 skews are voting issues, but things that claim it is ‘harder’ to affirm or negate aren’t. Prefer: A. Resolvability – 1) fairness and education claims can’t be weighed against structural skews in the activity – e.g. time skew, 2) different debaters skills make different strats abusive or non-abusive; numerical abuse is quantifiable 3) impossible to distinguish between being substantively abusive and being better; e.g. reading an aff that is true means you’re a better researcher – competing interps leads to a race to the bottom where you can’t vote for better debaters which is bad for a) jurisdiction – matters since that’s how we derive obligations, b) education – best ideas are excluded ; resolvability’s an independent voter since we can only debate if our arguments can be compared, and judges can’t vote for better debaters if they can’t arbitrate between arguments made. B. Substantive engagement – better debaters can overcome strategies that make it harder by improved research skills so it incentivizes engaging difficult positions, different number of burdens means that one debater has to be [ ] times as good so it requires uplayering.

Reasonability’s better than competing interps:

1. Competing interpretations means a 1% link to unfairness is enough to drop me, kills education since discussing potential round improvements mean they never happen since we debate rules for substance without applying them
2. Competing interps kills accessibility since standards of answering abuse claims requires knowledge external to things that are intuitively true – the instinct is to claim that there’s no implication to a strategy instead of explaining why a) an individual is the most educational, or b) structuring a counterinterpretation to the initial story, o/w on a) scope since it impacts a large number of debaters who want to join the activity, b)
3. Incentivizes debaters to craft absurd abuse scenarios that lead to a marginal harm but don’t inhibit judge ability to arbitrate

### Benefit of Debating Substance

Theory’s only a voter when the in-round benefits of debating theory outweigh the benefits of debating substance. To clarify: Debaters must be able to make weighing arguments as to why it is more likely for you to vote for the better debater or that the round is more educational if you vote on substance than theory. Prefer: A. Clash– forces you to answer my position if you could’ve engaged instead of reading theory; you’re incentivized to go for strategies that I can’t engage if I can’t weigh since you preclude my position, key to education since questioning makes us realize flaws in our ideas and fairness since better arguments are determined through comparison. B. Time skew – you nullify my position if we uplayer forever, kills fairness since all arguments can be traded linearly for time. C. Jurisdiction – your obligation is to vote for the better debater, doing that might require voting on substance – o/w on strength of link a) it’s written on the ballot making it most resolvable, b) can’t be a debate judge without judging debaters; if your best shot’s on substance then you must vote there; jurisdiction o/w everything 1) it’s the only link between good and ought which determines how judges vote – any refutation that says judges have other obligations cedes obligations come first so I outweigh on strength of link, 2) it’s a filter for other voters. D. Logical consistency – theory’s only used when it’s a check on abuse. E. Substantive education – we get none of you preclude; valuable since topical and philosophical debate are relevant to actions in the real world but we can’t read theory on things

Reasonability’s better than competing interps:

1. Competing interpretations means a 1% link to unfairness is enough to drop me, kills education since discussing potential round improvements mean they never happen since we debate rules for substance without applying them
2. Competing interps kills accessibility since standards of answering abuse claims requires knowledge external to things that are intuitively true – the instinct is to claim that there’s no implication to a strategy instead of explaining why a) an individual is the most educational, or b) structuring a counterinterpretation to the initial story, o/w on a) scope since it impacts a large number of debaters who want to join the activity, b)
3. Incentivizes debaters to craft absurd abuse scenarios that lead to a marginal harm but don’t inhibit judge ability to arbitrate

## RVIs Good

### RVIs Good – Generic

1. RVIs discourage frivolous theory, otherwise debaters will run shells for the positive time tradeoff on theory preventing theory shells and norms proposed from being considered legitimate, which
   1. o/w on longevity since positive norms ensure a future of educational and fair debate
   2. o/w on magnitude since abuse rectification in one specific round can never repair the original damage of running theory (i.e. we don’t debate under the norm we choose), whereas positive norms ensure future rounds are completely fair/education
2. Theoretical layer’s unfair otherwise a) theory must be reciprocal to enable both of ability to win the round, otherwise it’s a NIB for me, b) I can’t form a coherent strat without the RVI since they can go for whatever I undercover -- kills clash, key since best arguments are found through comparison and we learn about flaws in our ideas, c) Highest concentration of clash since the round comes to one issue, making it easiest to arbitrate, also leads to high quality issue comparison maximizing clash – and, reasons substance is unfair apply to theory as well since you can’t arbitrate legitimately – *if metatheory doesn't come first theory doesn’t either since uplayering can’t solve initial skews*
3. Best norms are proposed and voted for which leads to positive future
4. If we don’t have RVIs people will run as many shells as they possibly can since there is no deterrent, so we can never have a substantive discussion about the best norms

### RVIs Good w/ Weighing – Aff Specific

If I win my counter interp, vote for me.

1. Timeskew. 6 minute 2NR means the neg can always go for theory and substance which screws over the 2AR which has to cover both in three minutes.

*Outweighs. A. Timeskew is the strongest internal link to fairness since if I don’t have time to make arguments I have no shot at winning. Also link turns every education impact since if I don’t have the time to make arguments I can’t possibly engage in substance. B. Magnitude. Short 1ARs are the root cause of side bias.*

2. Reciprocity. No risk theory would exacerbate neg bias by giving them a free source of no risk offense that comes prior to all the AC offense.

*Outweighs. A. Magnitude. No RVI theory means the neg can just blitz out a bunch of theory shells and put a marginal amount of time on substance—I’m forced to go for everything in the 1AR and the NR gets to just pick one of their outs. B. Probability. Empirically confirmed by existing side bias.*

*Also, neg side bias proven by 6% win rate over 30,000 rounds impact turns every fairness on the line by line—if they prove the RVI is abusive that would just be a reason to prefer it since it compensates for side bias. This outweighs A. Probability—status quo proves side bias still goes neg even with RVIs and there’s still tons of theory. B. Magnitude—neg bias outweighs aff bias since it exacerbates existing structural skews.*

3. RVI checks dumb theory and promote topical clash by holding people accountable for their interpretations and making them think twice before reading dumb theory as a timesuck.

*Outweighs. A. I control uniqueness—theory is overused know so we need to promote measures that would at least attempt to minimize it. B. Turns back chilling effect—people are only deterred if their theory was stupid to start with. A little deterrence would go a long way in making debates more educational.*

4. Competing interps justifies the RVI since you should vote for the better interpretation for debate.

5. Independent of the RVI you should vote to endorse the better debate norm and ensure education in other rounds.

### 1AR RVI

If I win my counter interp, vote for me. 1. Timeskew. 6 minute 2NR means the neg can always go for theory and substance which screws over the 2AR which has to cover both in three minutes. 2. RVI checks dumb theory and promote topical clash by holding people accountable for their interpretations and making them think twice before reading dumb theory as a timesuck.

This is only true for the aff since A. Neg gets bidirectional theory interps but I have to set the terms for the debate which gives them reactivity. B. Aff is already deterred from bad theory since a minute of the 1AR is a quarter of the time but a minute of the 1NC is a seventh, so there’s a structural check against frivolous aff theory.

### A2 1AR Theory Solves

1. T-this promotes more theory instead of deterring it-kills substantive education.

2. This is just an assertion in the NC. Don’t allow any new 2NR explanation.

3. T-you double the timeskew by forcing me to read new theory and respond to your shell.

4. Doesn’t solve since sometimes no risk theory was the only NC abuse.

### 2NR RVI

Neg gets RVIs on theory.

1. Reciprocity. They can win on theory, so I should, too. Key to fairness-ensures equal access to the ballot.

2. Timeskew. RVIs compensate for the time I had to spend responding to theory—key to fairness since I can’t win if I don’t have time to make arguments.

3. Key to prevent theory from being run as time suck. Otherwise, it’s a no risk voter for the aff which moots fairness.

4. Competing interps justifies the RVI since you should vote for the better interpretation for debate.

5. Key to ensure proportional punishment—by reading bad theory you were proactively abusive so you deserve to lose.

6. Independent of the RVI you should vote to endorse the better debate norm and ensure education in other rounds.

### A2 Bait Theory

1. The only way you prove abuse is if you win theory – you didn’t so it’s unverifiable – unverifiable arguments are bad since judges can’t give proportional punishments
2. N/u – you can write a backfile
3. You’re the worse debater if you can’t win a debate where you’re on the right side of the issue
4. Me being prepped is not structural skew - the judge has an obligation to vote on the flow

### A2 Chilling Effect

1. If debaters are reading good theory shells, then the RVI won’t deter them since they can just win the shell.

2. T – RVIs chill bad theory which increases substantive education.

3. No impact – get better at theory; if you don’t you’re the worst debater so should lose; double bind – either a) you’re on the right side of the issue; if you cant win it you should lose, or b) your shell’s frivolous

4. Over-chilling is empirically denied by the last 3 years of RVI debates.

### A2 Defense Into Offense

1. No – I generate offense on the theoretical layer by proving my interp’s better
2. No – RVI is reasons false interps are proactively abusive so function as metatheoretical concerns

### A2 Illogical

1. No impact—no internal link from logic to fairness; AND T -- rewards for being fair are good since I’ll be fair in the future

2. RVIs are logical—I win since it’s best for debate and you were unfair

3. Being fair doesn’t mean we go back to substance – I did best debating on highest layer so you must vote for me

### A2 Norm Setting

1. Logically inconsistent – you might realize [affirming/negating] is true in round but have to defend a position
2. T – makes us think about best norms to introduce since we have to defend them through all round
3. T – bad for clash since you can delink my args so we never have debates about norms creation – o/w on scope since we understand all norms conceptually if we think about specific concepts we value

### A2 Prepskew

1. Non unique. Debaters who read theory can get good at reading theory and beat back the abuse.

2. No impact – you can win the interp regardless of the RVI.

3. No abuse—I don’t do abusive things so the warrant doesn’t apply.

*4. T-aff strategic leeway is good. It checks back neg-flex and big school prep outs.*

### A2 Read Your Own Shell

1. Doesn’t solve – a) If you are not abusive beyond no RVI I’m at a disadvantage on theory so always lose, b) I’ll lose the original shell from time skew so you can always make strength of link weighing so I can’t win the weighing debate
2. Supercharges abuse on your shell since you cede I have to generate offense on the theoretical layer
3. Cedes I can read another shell, which I did. Arbitrary preclusion – I have the right to read a shell, my shell is a meta-theoretical shell that says debaters may not read theory that doesn’t propose the best norm on your original shell
4. Incentivizes frivolous theory which is bad since
   1. We can never get to substance which is why you justify theory in the first place
   2. O/W on longevity and scope since the worst norms are promoted, sine
      1. I just propose a shitty norm
      2. Legitimate norms aren’t taken seriously – i.e. boy who cried wolf scenario

### A2 Topical Clash

1. T – de-incentivizes friv theory since there’s a risk so we have more substance later
2. No impact – when you introduce theory we can’t engage substance
3. T – clash on one issue’s better; massive time skew on substance means you always win so it’s not valuable since clash lets us compare ideas to question them
4. T – better norms by focusing on theory means we get better substantive education in future rounds

## RVIs Bad – Aff Specific

### A2 Neg can go all in on theory in the 2n

1. if you’re on the right side of the issue, it’s easy to win, no reason why time means I automatically win the shell
2. you can collapse for three minutes in the 2a
3. if I don’t collapse for six minutes in the 2n this goes away
4. disincentivizing theory is good since it kills substantive debate, you should only read theory if you know you’re on the right side of the issue
5. you can read multiple shells and weigh against the RVI so I can’t just collapse on one shell
6. incentivizes you to read as many shells as you possibly can in the 1a since there’s no consequence – kills substantive debate since you collapse in the 2a and go for framing

### A2 Reciprocity

1. if your only abuse is reading a shell w/out an RVI than I need the RVI to gain offense on the theoretical layer
2. T is a subset of theory – you get shells like “neg can’t do x” which I don’t have access to which solves reciprocity concerns
3. It’s not inevitable you undercover it, it means you’re inefficient which isn’t a structural disadvantage it proves you’re the worse debater
4. Not true -- you can read T about what it means to negate – e.g. comparing worlds, truth testing, or neg must defend converse and 1ar T as to what converse is

### A2 6 Minute 2nr solves abuse

1. No - if you introduce a ton of unrecipricol layers it becomes impossible to win since I’ll inevitably undercover something, you can underdevelop args and twist them in the 2ar since they implication was unclear and I don’t have a 3nr to respond

### A2 Rectify aff time skew

1. Even if you buy 6% time skew – they’re not doing the necessary comparison to prove the abuse from no RVI on 1ar theory is equal to time skew but it’s disproportionate since there’s 100% skew on every shell they read in the 1a so there’s a 96% skew against me
2. T – exacerbates neg time skew since you get last speech and frame the debate and make weighing which matters most since that’s how judges decide, not just based on number of arguments especially since we both have 6 minutes; you can collapse in the 1a since it’s no risk

## RVIs Bad On T

### Dump

RVIs on T suck.

1. Illogical. Just since you are topical doesn’t mean you should win. If that were true, aff would always win; also outweighs your timeskew claims
2. Chilling effect. Either I read T and you beat me with your 4 minute prep out or I don’t read theory and abusive practices prevail-both kill fairness; specifically bad since you’re well prepped on definitions you meet
3. Topical clash. RVIs kill substantive debate. Once theory is initiated we can never go back to substance, since it’s unnecessary so nobody will engage in the topic.
4. Norm setting. I can’t concede that the counter-interp is better even if I come to that realization in the middle of the round, so the RVI forces debaters to argue for bad debate practices, which is inimical to the most fair and educational interps in the long run.
5. T’s key neg ground since it lets me see the function of an aff; I might be wrong since I’m less familiar with it

### A2 Reciprocity

1. No abuse
   1. read another shell in the 1a
   2. you get access to shells like “neg can’t do X”
   3. you can say “neg must prove converse” and read 1ar T
2. You can just collapse on an alt shell and weigh in the 2a

### A2 Time Skew

1. No abuse -- just read spikes as to why your T in the aff
2. No abuse – this is super predictable since there’s a limited number of words in the res so you should have this prepped
3. you should have this shell prepped so it takes a minimal amount of time to read, if you take too long to respond to it it proves you’re the worse debater so it’s not a structural disadvantage, it’s the judge’s constitutive obligation to drop you

### A2 2nr can collapse in the 2n

1. It’s not impossible I did it one time – empirical claim w/out an empirical warrant
2. If I spend six minutes on theory then you auto win substance so there’s no abuse
3. If you’re on the right side of the theoretical issue time doesn’t matter since my argument quality will always be worse

No link to why an RVI solves T – if I have to win my shell and your shell the 2NR is split between issues, so I probably lose your shell and you can just collapse to weighing in the 2a

## RVIs Bad

### No RVIs

1. Illogical. Just since you are fair doesn’t mean you should win. If that were true, both debaters would win rounds without theory, which would be irresolvable, and resolvability comes first since every debate needs a winner.

2. Chilling effect. Either I read theory and you beat me with your 4 minute prep out or I don’t read theory and abusive practices prevail-both kill fairness.

3. Topical clash. RVIs kill substantive debate. Once theory is initiated we can never go back to substance, since it’s unnecessary so nobody will engage in the topic.

4. Norm setting. I can’t concede that the counter-interp is better even if I come to that realization in the middle of the round, so the RVI forces debaters to argue for bad debate practices, which is inimical to the most fair and educational interps in the long run.

### A2 Timeskew

1. T-I waste more time on theory since the initiator has to read a voter. I had to spend time reading my theory shell in first place, time loss is equitable since he can spend 45 seconds responding to the theory argument which is how much time I spent reading it.
2. T-RVIs skew my time since now I have to over cover theory just to ensure that I won’t lose.
3. T-RVIs themselves are a timesuck since they’re a really quick argument that have to be answered since they’re a voter
4. No brightline. All arguments skew time since they must be answered. Doesn’t mean they should get RVIs. For example you don’t get an RVI for beating back a link turn to a kritik.
5. No abuse -- timeskew is easily solved by word economy and spreading drills—get faster to deal with the timeskew theory may create.
6. T — if theory is an RVI negs will read 7 minutes of theory skewing the 1AR.
7. Non unique. If it wasn’t theory I would have read some other substantive position that skewed your time.
8. If you’re worried about wasting time just go for quick and dirty 100% defense arguments like “I meet” and “drop the arg”.
9. Judges are less willing to vote on stupid theory. If you’re actually fair, you can deal with it in 20-30 seconds.

### A2 Reciprocity

1. Not key to reciprocity. You can say I bite my interp read a prefiat position like a kritik. Here’s some stuff you could have gone for:
   1. A shell with weighing
   2. Theory isn’t a voter
   3. K on theory
   4. Substance outweighs theory
   5. K and K before theory
2. T-RVIs skew qualitative reciprocity since proactively proving a theory violation is substantially harder to do than simply win defense on theory. Since I have the positive burden of proof, RVIs make my opponent’s job to win the round much easier. Qualitative reciprocity outweighs numerical reciprocity since the only reason we care about the number of burdens is since they make the debater’s job qualitatively harder.

### A2 Deters Frivolous

1. T-you promote more theory prolif since debaters will read abusive positions, bait theory and then prep out the theory debate and win on the RVI.

2. T-it may check some unnecessary theory but it will also check necessary theory and cause debaters to be afraid to call out abuse.

3. Uniqueness overwhelms—almost every round is dominated by theory nowadays meaning no unique benefit to marginally increasing substance.

4. We don’t need an additional check: A. Bad theory arguments are false. False arguments are easy to beat. B. Judges are already less willing to vote on bad theory.

5. This is unverifiable. We don’t actually know that people will stop running bad theory because of RVIs. I’ve lost on RVIs before and it didn’t discourage me from running theory, it just forces me to prep harder against the RVI.

### A2 C/I means the RVI

1. All my arguments about why RVIs are bad answers this back, since all my arguments give reasons why even under competing interps it’s bad to vote for a defensive counter-interp without a violation. For example, doing so encourages abusive practices and RVI scripts, there shouldn’t be disincentives to introduce theory to the debate, etc.
2. There needs to be a reason why reading false theory was unfair (i.e. an RVI), otherwise a world in which you vote for the counter-interp is not better than the one in which you don’t. The world in which you accept the counter-interp without voting for them is better since we get to debate under their interp, so we actually get the good effect of debating under their norm.
3. T-there is a difference between justifying abuse and actually being abusive. Competing interps should want to deter instances of abuse, not people justifying it, since that discourages open and substantive discussion of what the fairest interps are.
4. This assumes a much more radical form of competing interps than the one justified in the round, i.e. that the purpose of the ballot is to promote the best norms for debate overall, which is essentially a discourse argument. The weaker sense of competing interps as justified in this round is that the judge chooses the best interp, regardless of whether the opposing one is reasonable, and drops the argument or the debater IF a violation of the rule occurs.
5. If there is no violation of the counter-interp, then it doesn’t make sense to vote for it since no illegitimate arguments were brought that ought to be deterred.
6. I can’t concede that the c-interp is better even if I come to that realization in the middle of the round, so the RVI forces debaters to argue for bad debate practices, which is inimical to the most fair and educational interps in the long run.

### A2 Positive Reinforcement for Being Fair

#### Empirically, rewarding someone in one scenario causes them to stop doing something once the reward is taken away

**Kohn 14[[3]](#footnote-3)**

Thus, for example, **every study that has looked at the topic has found that students** who are **led to focus on improving** their **grades tend to be**come **less interested in learning** as a result. And at least two studies have found that **children who get positive reinforcement** from their parents **for helping or sharing actually become less helpful and more self-centered as a result.** They’ve learned that the only reason to do something for someone else — or, in the other example, the only reason to learn — is because they’ll be rewarded for doing so. **When the reward is no longer available, they’re less inclined to help or learn than they were to begin with.**

Means 1) they’ll never be fair if they lose the RVI debate so it’s a terrible norm, 2) people stop caring about fairness and education – o/w a) scope – impacts behavior in every round, b) magnitude – marginal impact to winning an RVI debate in this round since abuse already happened, but future behavior makes a completely fair round completely unfair

## 2nr RVI bad

All neg warrants for RVIs must be in the 1NC. They violate if they read a 2NR RVI. Prefer: A. Clash-initiating the RVI earlier ensures a more nuanced debate about the benefits of giving it to you. Starting it in the 2NR means we get no clash and we might set bad norms for the round and make the wrong theory decision. B. stratskew-the 2AR is too short to cover a neg RVI dump and win substance so you make it impossible to form a coherent strategy.

# Framing

## Time Skew Affirms – 2:15

### Dump

1. NC is reactive so can strategically concede arguments and hijack most of the AC – o/w on a) reversibility - losing most of the ac as leverage puts aff at a 6 minute time disadvantage that can't be overcome since speech time is fixed, and b) measurability – since it’s quantifiable c) 4 minutes to deal with 7 minutes means rebuttal time is irrecipricol
2. Empirically verified—a) majority flip neg, which shows the best debaters know negating is easiest, b) 7% side bias as verified on Vbriefly - stats o/w on a) probability since they analyze the validity of arguments and enable quantified comparison, which also means they o/w on measurability, and b) link to real world education since empirical evidence enables us to communicate and back up personal opinions
3. 2n can be infinitely abusive but judges don’t vote on 2ar theory so I can’t win
4. Neg can restart the round in the 1n by uplayering - I then have 7 minutes to generate relevant offense whereas they have 13
5. Aff has burden of proof which is more difficult since they don’t need to win a competing claim, but point out flaws with my position
6. Neg can read T, I can’t
7. There are infinite worlds or ways to disprove the res, but I’m bound to one text – means that they’re at a prep advantage so can give maximally efficient speeches and have access to higher quality ground
8. You get six minutes of collapse to voters whereas I get three, this matter since judges only vote on implicated arguments so a time advantage to explain interaction forms the clearest path to the ballot – if I collapse and go for weighing early you can straight turn for six minutes, or refute weighing and go for another arg so an irrecipricol coverage burden
9. 1ar has to hedge bets on neg collapsing to any arg in the 2n so I’m spread thin over 7 minutes of offense whereas neg can choose any argument I undercover, so you get more time to explain argument interaction and frame – matters since issue selection is how judges resolve competing arguments
10. You can under explain arguments and have better nc coverage since you can go for 2nr expansions, whereas you get to interpret unclear aff arguments, and I have half as much time to clarify
11. You have access to more positions a) generic backfiles are more applicable on Neg - you can read the same skep nc and state action bad k but other affs prove a different res true, b) NCs are shorter so are easier to write, this matters since a) you have more paths to the ballot, b) your positions are less predictable – it’s harder for me to prep you out, matters since pre round argument generation gives access to highest quality evidence and maximizes in round efficiency
12. Neg has 13 minutes to read reactive theory while aff only has four
13. People are more likely to choose the squo when making a decision.

SAMUELSON 1**[[4]](#footnote-4)**

The p values for this test are listed in the last column of the table. The null hypothesis of indistinguishable SQ [status quo] and ASQ [alternative status quo] response rates is rejected at the 10% significance level in 31 out of 54 cases. Tables 1a-1c demonstrate **the[re is]** presence of (**statistically significant**) **status quo bias across decision tasks and across alternatives within decision tasks.** Pooling the data in these tables provides a summary measure of the overall degree of bias. Toward this end, we consider the simple model described by the equation pair: SQ= a + bNEUT and ASQ = c + dNEUT where NEUT denotes the percentage of reponses for a given alternative under neutral framing. SQ is the percentage when it occupies the status quo position and ASQ is the percentage when it is an alternative to the status quo. If status quo bias is present it follows that **[status quo is greater than]** SQ > **[neutral which is greater than]** NEUT > **[alternative status quo]** ASQ **for any given** choice **alternative.**

1. Neg extends arguments once, but aff does twice—means I have to devote a greater percentage of my speech time explaining an arguments, but they have a greater amount of time to beat back my advocacy and generate new arguments
2. Neg can make weighing args for 13 minutes whereas weighing args in the aff are less useful since either a) that puts one contention first so it moots others since you can just link turn that for 7 minutes, b) they're preempts so you can choose a strat that doesn't bite into preempts and they're useless, since weighing is comparitive, this matters since we need to weigh to resolve between competing arguments
3. You can go for args that play to your strengths whereas I'm constricted to framework and contention

### A2 Substantive Presumption Negates

1. Substantive presumption affirms
   1. Negate[[5]](#footnote-5) means to **prove** negative; show **to be false** so the neg has the proactive burden to disprove the resolution.
   2. Ought[[6]](#footnote-6) is defined as **used to express** justice, **moral rightness.** An action is right if there isn’t a prohibition on it. Timmons[[7]](#footnote-7)
      1. When the term is used broadly, **right action is the opposite of wrong action: an action is right**, in the broad sense of the term, **when it is not wrong. For instance, to say of someone that what she did was right conveys the idea that her act was morally in the clear---that it was alright for her to do,** that what she did was not wrong**. Since actions that are not wrong include the categories of both the obligatory and the optional, talk of right action** (in the broad sense) **covers both of these categories.**

Timmons O/W, a) contextualizes usage- key since we only understand words through application, b) he’s a philosophy professor – most applicable for LD debate since we have philosophical discussions

1. Theoretical presumption comes first since
   1. you can’t choose the better debater if the round’s skewed
   2. we need higher level arguments to determine who gets what ground; one person being neg and the other aff is outlined by those rules so saying it’s neg ground cedes that we need theory

### A2 Preemption Solves Uplayering

1. Proves abuse – I have to spent some of the AC predicting what arguments you could read but you can shift out of them
2. T – exacerbates abuse, if I spend three minutes generating theoretical offense, you can read a K of theory, or go for substance and I’m at a time disadvantage

## Presume Neg

### Theoretical

1. Arguments aren't implicated in the Aff, so I have must answer everything, whereas you know what to prioritize in the 1a so your time is more efficient
2. Aff speaks first so they can frame the round by interpreting the resolution to something that puts them at an advantage
3. Aff gets infinite prep time before the AC, whereas neg gets four minutes, o/w on magnitude since, a) prep time controls the link to in round quality arguments, otherwise speech time isn't spent generating offense so prep time disparities are more impactful, b) We both have thirteen minutes, but you have drastically more prep time, also o/w on c) measurability since prep time comparison is quantifiable
4. Aff gets three speeches so they can readjust their strat based on argument interaction to form the best strat
5. Aff speaks last so they get final framing – matters since explanation of argument interaction is how judges arbitrate
6. Aff has ten minutes to generate offense whereas neg has 7, since 2nr arguments are new
7. Aff can be super abusive in the 1a and judges are much more reluctant to vote on 2n theory
8. Aff arguments aren’t implicated so you can extend framing issues to preclude the whole NC
9. You get spikes so can inform me what rules are/aren’t theoretically legitimate, incentivizing me to conform, whereas you speak first so you don’t know what would make the round unfair for me
10. You can parametricize meaning I have infinite affs to write case negs against, so your frontlines will be more developed than my case answers, means you’re also a) at a time advantage since pre written arguments are most efficient, b) you have higher quality arguments since you can supplement your views with the arguments of others
11. You have two valid speeches to generate offense on theory, but I only have the NC, since you can shit on 2nr theory in the 2a and I can’t rebuild
12. You can generate offense in the 1ar that you get the last say on, I don’t get the chance to rebuild 2nr arguments, so the qualitatively best time flows aff
13. 2ARs are most persuasive since aff’s arguments are the last thing judges hear
14. You can piece together conceded aff arguments to form a coherent ballot story since I didn’t understand how they functioned together
15. 100% of 2014 TOC Octas ballots were for Aff
16. Neg has to preempt everything in the 2n and waste speech time since they don’t know what aff will say

### Substantive

1. A statement is more likely false than true since any part can be false.
2. “Resolved” means “firmly determined to do something” so without a proactive reason to affirm, we wouldn’t be firmly determined and the resolution would be false.
3. Topical presumption comes first.
   1. It’s logically distinct. Theoretical presumption only kicks in if you don’t know whether the topic’s true, but my definitions show that if there’s no offense, you know the topic’s false, so there’s no need to go to theory.
   2. Your jurisdiction to evaluate the resolution is your procedural role as a judge since it’s a precondition for warrants on the flow mattering at all. This precedes any normative impacts on presumption like fairness or education since those warrants only matter given a role of a judge in which you have a duty to evaluate them on the line-by-line.
4. Presuming neg is key to fairness and real world education.

**Colling 12**[[8]](#footnote-8)

**A** ‘tabula rasa **default neg**ative lacking affirmative offense’ **paradigm is** also **real world because it is similar to** the way issues are ‘resolved’ in **court**s. **The prosecution has a burden to prove the accused guilty** in a criminal trial, or the plaintiff has a burden to prove their case in civil law. The defendant in either case, unless some type of affirmative defense is submitted, does not have this reciprocal burden. **Requiring a reciprocal burden would be** an **unfair** imposition upon the defendant because it would presume some level of guilt. The same would apply to the negative in a debate round **as it would presume the resolution true** on some level (**which** again also **defies the rules of logic.**) **The legalistic model is** as real world as the legislative model, as cases are considered daily by the courts. It could even be considered **more ‘real world’ considering the great frequency of court cases** resolved compared to legislation passed by Congress, **and more debaters end up lawyers than** the debaters that end up **legislators. The legalistic model seems a better fit for LD** as well considering the variety of issues and resolutions debated annually. Courts consider a large variety of issues on a daily basis. Certainly legislative bodies do as well, but while some LD value resolutions are focused on the value of policies, others are more focused on individual, ethical issues. Courts consider policies, at least the Constitutionality of policies, but they also must deal with the individualized concerns of the particular parties in each case. Legislative model paradigms are valuable and beneficial, but there is certainly no logical justification for why the legislative model should apply exclusively to LD, assuming it is applicable at all. So, in LD, negative offense should never be absolutely essential for a negative ballot because, in courts, the defendant, unless opting for an affirmative defense need not prove anything other than that the prosecutor or plaintiff did not prove their case.

### A2 Statistics

1. Prefer analytics: stats alone are useless since all data can be manipulated – empirics only serve as proof of analytical claims, they can’t come prior to them.
   1. E.g. just since one day you won a round and my mom lost her job probably doesn’t mean you shouldn’t win rounds
2. Stats are flawed – bad aff strategies lead to skew instead of structural problems
3. Stats vary per topic and tournament so reject studies that haven’t evaluated the judging/pool for this specific round
4. People more accustomed with the circuit flip neg – correlation not causation
5. Time based arguments are numerical so are statistics
6. ***This 7% statistic is BS. It was made from a few kids from Scarsdale who don’t actually care about accuracy and methodology. Moreover, it was done a few years ago—debate has changed a lot so those rounds aren’t relevant.***

### A2 Enter Round Blind

1. T- aff enters less blind than neg since they frame the round and inherently have a better idea how framework and advocacy nuances function
2. We debate both sides at tournaments so affs know common neg strats
3. T-speaking first allows the aff to utilize a million blippy spikes, which is preferable for the aff since entire swaths of neg speech time can be precluded in seconds by spikes that the neg will inevitably drop.
4. *No abuse – I disclose*

## Weighing

### Flowability >

1. flowability outweighs everything
   1. jurisdiction – arguments can’t be attributed to the better debater if they’re not debateable
   2. engagement– doesn’t matter if your arguments are fair or educational if they don’t have a link to the ballot and can’t be discussed
   3. controls the internal link to your arguments – I have NO ability to engage your positions so you can be infinitely abusive; also means I outweigh on strength of link since we can’t access your offense

# Meta Theory

## Framing

### Accept Meta Theory

1. Theory’s a voter since we can’t arbitrate substance, if we can’t arbitrate theory we need a new layer
2. Meta theory’s necessary to determine if you have access to your initial interp
3. Let’s us have best enforcement of norms, o/w on a) longevity since it allows best norms to stay in the community, and b) scope since rules can be accepted by all debaters
4. Necessary check against irresolveable shells
5. ***Unless meta theory is real, the whole round collapses and theory’s on the same layer as substance***

### Reject Meta Theory

1. Incentives abuse-debaters will read unfair practices to bait theory and then read strategic meta theory in the 1AR-kills fairness since the aff will do as many unfair things as possible.
2. Infinite regress-the bright line to stop at is theory since it is still discussing substance. Once, we move to metatheory all substance is avoided and we lose key education. That makes the round irresolvable since there can be infinite shells-resolvability outweighs your shell since every debate needs a winner.
3. Chilling effect-if metatheory can be run on theory shells then debaters would never challenge the abuse in good theory debater’s cases for fear of losing on metatheory which allows for infinite abuse.
4. Meta theory is unreciprocal-they can read meta theory in the 1AR and 2AR but I can only read it in the 2NR-gives you a 2-1 advantage that makes it easier for you to win.
5. Even if meta theory is relevant, it can only be a reason to drop the argument. The drop the debater claims on theory prove that substance was skewed so there’s nowhere else to vote, but your shell only proves that theory was skewed which means that we can still look to substance.
6. Clash. Meta theory causes a race to the highest layer where people run away from substance if they are afraid of debating it-kills education and advocacy skills since we don’t need to discuss the topic.
7. Illogical. The difference between theory and substance arises since theory informs which substantive arguments matter. This means you can only get a theoretical violation from substance, not other theory.
8. *Meta theory is an unjustified RVI-if it’s good for theory to be no risk you reject their shell*
9. even if meta theory is legitimate, it does not preclude normal theory. It’s possible to weigh inter-shell since they both impact back to the same voter. If I’m winning that my shell better upholds fairness then a metatheory shell with a smaller link to fairness is meaningless.

# Overviews

## 2nr weighing > 2ar weighing

1. Higher probability my weighing analysis is true since
   1. I have a longer speech to develop arguments
   2. I'm held to a higher standard since they'll answer my weighing but I don't have a 3nr to respond to their 2ar weighing, also means you reject 2ar responses to these arguments
2. New 2ar weighing isn't in your jurisdiction since it can't be attributed to the better "debater" - debate is discussion and comparison of arguments but the args aren't part of a debate if I don't have the opportunity to respond to them
3. Each of us deserve two speeches to develop weighing, the 1ar has the responsibility to weigh since by that point all issues are introduced so they should prioritize what matters, I can't do that until the 2n since I don't know how to weigh against 1ar arguments that haven't been made since quality weighing is always comparative not claiming some objective fact to be unconditionally true - I.e. X may o/w y but not z
4. Key to clash since we have a higher amount of speech time to focus in depth on a couple of issues that matter, this lets us focus on comparing beliefs instead of spreading each other out, key to education since it lets us understand benefits and flaws of arguments which matters since its the only reason people debate and schools fund it
5. Discourages aff from delaying weighing into the 2a in hope their opponent won't respond to it, which nullifies an entire speech
6. Only way I can form a coherent strat, otherwise they can go for whatever I undercover in the 2ar - I.e. Weighing analysis or offense, but I never know what they're going to go for so have to undercover every level of the debate. I don't know how you'll frame the debate so have to spend time making preemptive arguments to everything you might say, whereas you can just go in depth on arguments I don't preempt so my burden is significantly larger making it more difficult to win the round this killing fairness, which matters since the judges' obligation is to vote for the best debater which they can't do if the round is already skewed

## Aff Theory > Neg Theory

1. Neg can win their shell and beat back the aff shell, whereas it’s impossible for me to beat back their shell and my shell in the 2AR. The 2NR explodes neg’s strategic options (they can kill aff on defense on theory and go for substance, or just go hard for one shell), but aff needs to sit down on one arg to win in the 2AR. Prefer structural weighing args about aff vs. neg since they apply to each round so are most likely to establish communal norms, and thus are best for competing interps, which means it also precludes meta-theory. **and** my theory comes before T since it’s also inherent to every round, not a particular topic.

## Neg Theory > Aff Theory

1. I don’t have a 3N to respond to the 2AR, meaning err neg since there’s no way I could possibly preempt all 2A responses and weighing. Also judges give more credence to 2A responses.
2. They can read a sketch Aff and a frivolous shell in the 1A and collapse to what I undercover since I can’t win substance – kills strat which is key since that’s how I form a path to the ballot; and, answering these args proves the abuse cuz the skew makes it harder for me to extend.
3. Neg abuse is responsive to the abusive aff so even if I’m being abusive, that’s self imposed; also means that my shell solves the abuse on yours
4. No one buys 2N theory, meaning aff has 10 minutes to make theory args and I only have 7 minutes.
5. 1Ar theory is easier since you get two speeches to develop it, whereas I only get one to respond
6. Strat skew: I need to win a C/I and an RVI to win theory but they only need to win the interp; I need two speeches to develop and preempt but only get one so you go for what I undercover in the 2a; also means if I’m behind on the line by line it’s time skew not lack of truth in my arguments so you vote on my shell anyway

## Reject 1ar theory

1. Time skew---you get 7 minutes to generate offense on theory while I only get six which means your always going to be ahead
2. 2ar can collapse to either theory or substance so I have to split my time between both, and you can just go for whatever layer I undercover, *(if no RVI) and if I can’t garner offense on the high*est *layer,* *it becomes incredibly unreciprocal bc you have more time to make args on the highest layer, while I can’t even win there.*
3. 1ar theory begs judge intervention since your responses to my counter-interp will be new in the 2a, and I don’t have a 3nr to respond to them, so the judge has to evaluate the validity of your arguments against mine, without necessarily voting on what was on the flow, judge intervention o/w all other fairness claims since without the judge evaluating args made on the flow, the winner of a round is completely arbitrary
4. 1ar theory restarts the debate in the 1a by uplayering which nullifies all the 1n and AC arguments made, kills clash since we can’t actually explore the implications of those args made if aff just goes for a higher layer, clash outweighs other education claims since it’s the unique education we get from debating different positions
5. 1ar theory makes aff a moving target since there are infinite permutations of args in the shell they can go for new weighing for in the 2a, which means I can never know which args to actually spend time responding to
6. I don’t have cx after the 1ar which lets you get away with more sketchiness in your shell since I don’t have the time to ask you about the implications of all the args, and if you extend any sketchy arguments from the shell into the 2a that just proves the abuse since I couldn’t ask about its implication.
7. 1ar theory lets aff get away with super abusive 1a strats since they already have offense on the theoretical layer to weigh against new 2n theory, which judges are already reluctant to buy
8. 1ar theory kills substantive engagement since it encourages a 2n blip storm on theory so that there’s an arg left conceded out of the 2a, killing all substantive engagement since there’s just a blitz of i-meets/turns on theory instead of actually engaging args.
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